20c DECEMBER 29, 1952 LATTIMORE, VINCENT AND LOYALTY—page 5

New Republic

SOUTH AFRICA SEETHES

Rev. Arthur W. Blaxall, the Superintendent in Alan Paton's novel, describes the rebirth of Gandhi's Faith in the "Beloved Country"

Essays and Reviews

CROCE'S PLACE IN ITALIAN CULTURE
By Paolo Milano

Lewis Namier, *IN THE NAZI ERA*
By Gerald W. Johnson

JAN 3 1953

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

Keeping Stevenson Going

● A few weeks ago I wrote saying that I wanted to contribute to a Stevenson fund. Now I learn that Governor Stevenson is unwilling to use funds for other purposes until the campaign deficit is cleared. Paying this off may not be exciting, but we are begging for his leadership, so let's follow him. He's earned our trust—now let us earn his.

I ask to be released from my promise of a monthly contribution so that I may do what seems more constructive—add my bit to clearing the road for Stevenson.
Lincoln, Nebr. JEAN HAGGARD

● Please help the "Stevenson Speaks" cause by pointing out that Governor Stevenson wishes to pay off present debts before making more expenditures. Those of us who took a chance and mailed contributions last month to Springfield have been requested to give permission for the headquarters to use the money for that purpose.

It is hard to keep up one's enthusiasm for a new cause in the face of old bills, but only a moment's consideration is required to see the necessity of such a course. To save time and two extra letters new contributors with real interest in the cause would do well to give such permission with their first contribution.

Could the *New Republic* keep us posted on progress made toward the goal of getting the Governor on the air?
Seattle, Wash. CHARLES A. WOODWORTH

● Here are two more people who would like to keep Stevenson in the "public eye" through radio and television with the aid of a continuing fund. We almost feel responsible for the election by not contributing more to his campaign.

In fact, now that the election is over, we feel a definite need for a man of his calibre . . . to keep talking sense to the American public and also let them know more about Adlai Stevenson. To be brief—he's our boy and we miss him!

Might it not be a good idea to have the date and time of the Governor's speeches printed in the *New Republic*? In the past it has been difficult to get this information from the local papers.
EMANUEL AND BARBARA ANGELOS
East Haven, Conn.

[Listed below are names of others who have written in expressing a desire to contribute to a fund to keep Stevenson on the air. If you would like your name added to the list write to us.—THE EDITORS.]

Ann Abbott, Oakland, Calif.; Mrs. H. Goldschmidt, San Antonio, Tex.; Jerome Greiner, Lititz, Pa.; Tom Heerman, Waukesha, Wis.; Mrs. Elizabeth S. Kent, Pasadena, Calif.; Dr. and Mrs. M. B. Levine, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mr. and Mrs. M. M. Perkins, Long Island, N.Y.; Constance Villiamy, Parkville, Mo.; Homer L. Williams, Parkville, Mo.; Betty L. Young, Phoenix, Ariz.

The One-Party Press

● Many, many thanks for your fine article on "The One-Party Press." *(NR,* Nov. 17.) This is a subject of such vital importance to the democratic system that I believe its full meaning has never been understood by our legislators or our electorate. . . .

There have been until now only three safeguards against the vast power for evil of our press. These are: (a) the tendency of people not to believe what they read in the papers; (b) the liberal bias and educated intelligence of many reporters; and (c) the hesitancy of publishers to appear as obvious political mouthpieces for fear of legislative action. But I have argued wildly with my husband (a newspaperman) that all three of these deterrents are daily dwindling. People may not believe all they read today, but if they read it again tomorrow and again the next day, their resistance disappears. Furthermore, any publicity is good—it doesn't matter what McCarthy says, if he's in the headlines often enough. Secondly, so many people want to be reporters, that the publisher has his choice of political bias, and can winnow out the liberals. . . .

First, the papers should be required by law to give only facts in their news stories, to give all the facts, and to give equal space and equal prominence to both sides of any controversy. Whatever else is needed, I leave to more intelligent minds than my own.

Second, no publication, which is supported largely by advertisers of the usual political bigotry, should be allowed the almost free use of the mails. It would be most healthy if newspapers could depend for their income directly on the subscriber rather than the advertiser. This would enable the Democrats, who have so little advertising prestige, to maintain more of a showing against this heavy Republican encroachment on the "free press."

In the meantime, I wish the *New Republic* the best of health. . . . I hope you attempt not to confine yourself to the intellectual but to gain in circulation among the masses as one of those lonely voices for reason, truth and equity.
Sausalito, Calif. MRS. R. E. THOMPSON

● Your disclosures of the pro-Republican press are accurate, but critics of the *New Republic* are sure to retort that *NR's* own treatment of the campaign was anything but two-sided.

Readers like myself have the obvious answer. I believe the editors should put it in print—*now.*

Let me add that the *NR's* technique of sensationalism undergirded by constructive truth could be, in my opinion, an object lesson (and happy omen) to all Americans who place small faith in the profession of journalism.
Bozeman, Mont. PAT NICHOLSON

● Robert H. Hammond, Baltimore, Md., writing in the letters column *(NR,* Dec. 8) seems to have missed the boat in his analysis of the "One-Party Press." It is necessary in this case to differentiate between the newspaper "press" and the magazine "press," as each has its own peculiar function in mass communication.

Newspapers, more than magazines, can truly be called the most effective means of communication in the country. Nearly everyone reads a newspaper, whereas magazine circulation is, to a degree, limited. Newspapers circulated on a daily basis, can, if they desire, subject their readers to a constant barrage of material supporting one cause or another. The fact that the newspapers levelled their ammu-

(Continued on page 4)

Bandwagon

Brotherhood

● Governor McKay [new Secretary of the Interior] is a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled Veterans and many lodges and clubs. His friends say he would have joined the Knights of Columbus and the B'Nai B'rith, but could not qualify because he is a Protestant. — *From the Washington* Star.

And Two Chickens in Every Pot?

His home was typically American. He had two television sets, several radios, two electric clocks, a big refrigerator, fans, irons, a dozen lamps and other electrical devices. — *From the Washington* Daily News.

Americana

A South Korean soldier with the 45th division has learned to count in English by listening to his American buddies.

"One, two, three, four, five," he says, "six, seven, eight, nine, ten, jack, queen, king." — *From a UP dispatch.*

Our readers are invited to contribute; $2 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, c/o New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. — The Editors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR DEC. 29, 1952

5 Lattimore and Loyalty
An Editorial

7 The Du Pont Empire on Trial
by Richard S. Lewis

10 Candid Thoughts on Non-Violence, by Arthur W. Blaxall

13 "Was It Better under Hitler?"
by Anne Fremantle

16 IV. Point Four and the Battle for Asia, by Clarence Decker

18 Literature and the Arts:

18 Croce's Place in Italian Culture, by Paolo Milano

19 L. B. Namier, *In the Nazi Era*, by Gerald W. Johnson

20 Paul Tillich, *Courage to Be*, by A. Powell Davies

20 St. John Ervine, *Oscar Wilde*, by Paul Goodman

21 George Soule, *Ideas of the Great Economists*, by R. Lester

22 Books on Etiquette, by R. Evett

22 I Have a Bright Idea, by Eric Bentley

EDITOR, Michael Straight
CHAIRMAN, Editorial Board: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane
MANAGING EDITOR: Helen Fuller
LITERARY EDITOR: Robert Richman
REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Tom Fitzsimmons, Arnold J. Heidenheimer (on leave with the Armed Services)
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Eric Bentley, Drama Critic; Malcolm Cowley; Robert Evett, Music Critic.
CONTRIBUTING CRITICS: W. H. Auden, Dudley Fitts, Kimon Friar, Gerald Johnson, V. O. Key, Max Lerner, Richard Lester, James R. Newman, Kathleen Raine, John Crowe Ransom, Herbert Read, Mark Schorer, James Johnson Sweeney, Allen Tate, Robert Penn Warren
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: F. R. Ruskin
COPY ASSISTANT: Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1952 IN the USA BY WESTBURY PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2; D. C. EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 1416 F ST., N.W., WASHINGTON 4, D.C. BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49th ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50.

WASHINGTON WIRE

THIS IS the time of year when we love everybody, and we probably wouldn't even cross the street to kick Joe McCarthy, so let's away with bitterness, politics and social significance and, instead, hang our simple garland of anecdotes on the Christmas tree. Hey, nonny, nonny, it's a collection of comfits and glass balls that's been accumulating in our lower drawer for months.

* * * * *

A Washington teacher (so the story goes) called up the mother of a pupil recently in great agitation. Almost too embarrassed to tell the incident over the telephone, she at length screwed up courage. The artless little child, it seems, had been asked to fill out a form, one of which questions was, "Father's occupation?" The teacher reported in a low, horrified tone what the child had written: "Keeper of a bawdy house."

"Oh, that's all right, Miss Snaither," replied the parent reassuringly. "You see the child's father didn't want to injure Priscilla's reputation! He really works for the State Department, you know."

* * * * *

The audience settled down for an intellectual treat the other night as Mr. Justice Douglas gravely rose to respond to the speech giving him the $1,000 Sidney Hillman award. At times like this, said the Justice, the individual thinks over events of his past life and weighs the difference between the good and the bad. He had a fellow feeling for the Scotsman who suddenly received $1,000 and discovered, a month later, that it was all gone. "But what did you do with it, Thomas?" inquired friends. "Oh," responded the Scotsman, "it went easily; $500 went to the dance halls, and $200 to liquor." "But Thomas," said his friends, "what did you do with the other $300—?" With a look of regret Thomas responded, "The other $300? . . . I wasted *that!*"

Over in West Germany stories are seeping out from behind the barbed wire and barricades which show the kind of satire being directed against the Communists. It seems that Otto Grotewohl, the Soviet stooge in East Germany, was walking through the grounds of the park with Wilhelm Pieck, the President. They were chatting of the joy of working for the USSR, but a tiny note of sadness kept creeping in over the precariousness of public life. Alas! what did they see? The figure of a man hanging from a rope.

Grotewohl speaks first: "It is our activist — Adolph Pennecke!"

Says Pieck with a shudder that doesn't quite hide a trade of admiration: "Himmel! He's two years ahead of schedule again!"

* * * * *

Coming back from Capitol Hill after one of his grim bouts with a hostile Senate committee, Secretary of State Dean Acheson wearily altered a line of poetry to—"Home is the hunted, home from the Hill!" And in a happier moment David Cohn, the Southern writer who helped put together Adlai Stevenson's fine speech before Notre Dame University, considered their collaboration and called it "an Encyclical built for two."

* * * * *

Adlai Stevenson says he is receiving thousands of letters from people who voted for Ike but who feel they owe him a letter of explanation. Tens of thousands have come in, some of them quite long. "It's nice to hear from them, of course," Stevenson remarks, "but I can't help thinking how much time they would have saved themselves if they had simply written 'x' on election day."

* * * * *

Then there was an Eisenhower rally in North Carolina, in charge of a particularly polite and efficient master of ceremonies who was introducing a series of local leaders. There was time for only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two-minute talks, for a whole row of dignitaries sat right behind him on the outdoor plank platform, each waiting a turn. The presiding officer was equal to his task, however, giving each one a eulogistic introduction. At one point, after he had introduced the next speaker simply as probably the greatest man of his time, he turned to the waiting row while the crowd applauded and asked audibly, "Which one of you fellows wants to talk now?"

* * * * *

Competent authority assures this column that there was once a Congressman from the South named Robert Strange. He adjured his son, according to the legend, when his time came, to write a simple inscription on his anonymous tomb, merely the words, "Here Lies An Honest Congressman." The boy protested. "Surely, Father, you want your name inscribed on the marble slab?" But the wise old man shook his head. "No, my lad," he said, "as passers-by read that inscription they'll say, 'That's *strange*'!"

* * * * *

Another story smuggled from Moscow tells of an old woman, one who swept a streetcar switch clear with a broom made of faggots. She paused at the news *kiosk* every morning after her tedious night's work and examined the front page of *Pravda* and then went away sighing. Queried at last by the puzzled vendor, she replied, "I'm looking for a death notice." "But, you poor old Goodie," he replied, "don't you know that obituaries are always on the last page?"

"The one I'm looking for," said the old woman, "will be on the front page."

* * * * *

Someone, maybe even Stevenson himself, made up this little ditty:

Cheer up, little Mink Coat,
Don't you cry;
You'll be a Teapot
Bye-and-Bye.

* * * * *

And then there's the story—But here it is the bottom of the Christmas column. That anecdote can go over to next year.

Washington T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

(*Continued from page 2*)

nition against the Democrats was amply proved by the *NR* article of November 17, and surely Mr. Hammond must have been aware of this blatant misuse of the power of the press.

One may argue that magazines should have the same function in society, but this is not necessarily so. . . . A magazine can, to keep the interest of its subscribers, take a definite stand on certain issues. This is not as dangerous as it sounds, as a person can choose those magazines that conform to their particular beliefs. Senator McCarthy, for instance, does not have to read the *New Republic!* No such choice, however, is offered to the newspaper reader in areas where there may be only one or two newspapers, and such a situation does not lead to an enlightened, well-informed public opinion. . . .

No amount of whitewashing or pleas by editors or publishers will be able to convince 27 million Stevenson supporters that their candidate received fair and equal treatment from the hands of the press. I for one am glad that there are "partisan" organs like the *New Republic*. Where else can the electorate get an antidote against the Republican press?

St. Paul, Minn. KATHRYN ANN JOHNSON

Rabbi Silver

● If Nathan G. Horwitt before writing to the *New Republic* about "Rabbi Silver's Synthetic Indignation" *(NR,* Nov. 3) had informed himself he would have saved himself from appearing in the columns of a leading journal of opinion as an ill-informed person.

Many weeks before "the well-contrived press meeting between Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver and Eisenhower," Dr. Silver wrote the General asking him to make a statement on his personal views on Israel. In reply to that letter General Eisenhower invited Dr. Silver to meet him in person in New York to discuss the matter.

Neither the General nor Dr. Silver knew, when the date of the meeting was set, that the press would feature a statement by President Truman intimating that the General had joined the forces of darkness steeped in anti-Semitism and anti-Catholicism. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that the press was full of the Truman statement the very day when Dr. Silver visited the General. It was natural, under the circumstances, that the press should question Dr. Silver about his reaction to the Truman statement, as reported in the press . . . and ignore the true purpose of his conference with Eisenhower.

It ill behooves any one to rush into public prints and accuse Dr. Silver of all sorts of motives. I was for Stevenson, but that makes no difference to me in trying to set straight the readers of the *New Republic* on this matter. . . .

OSCAR LEONARD

Harmon on Hudson, N.Y.

Christmas Spirit

● I believe that the true meaning of Christmas has been altered somewhat, in recent years, by the commercialization of Christmas. Department stores and other merchants emphasize the giving of gifts too much.

Originally Christmas was solely a church anniversary observed by religious services. . . .

Today department stores over-emphasize gift-giving. It isn't the gift, but the thought behind the gift that makes it important. Christmas is, or should be, a season of good will among people.

St. Louis, Mo. MURRAY WEST

Eisenhower and Korea

● I concur with Sen. Wayne Morse when he called Eisenhower's voyage to Korea "a cheap grand-stand political play." What has he actually accomplished, and what has he learned that was not said before by Adlai Stevenson and the chiefs of staff? In my judgment the answer is an emphatic, "Absolutely nothing."

During the campaign Adlai Stevenson had repeatedly warned against spreading the war. He said there was no easy way out. He called for patience and a strong military in all branches. He said that he did not know how long the conflict would continue, that we would fight to overcome ruthless aggression as long as we had to. Eisenhower seems to concur with practically everything Adlai said in his campaign speeches. . . .

Lititz, Pa. JEROME GREINER

Home to Roost

● In your issue of December 8 I was greatly taken with the suggestion by T. R. B. that the Democrats should get a Publicity Director, like our old friend, Charlie Michelson. It made me feel homesick to think of him again. The suggestion is a most excellent one, and I think I know just the man to succeed Michelson. I don't know his name, but his pseudonym is T. R. B.

Boston, Mass. H. R. BYGRAVE

Notable Books

● Would you care to add to your Notable Books 1952 a couple of extra drama titles? They are A. M. Nagler's *Sources of Theatrical History* (Theatre Annual) and Philip Henderson's *Marlowe* (Longmans).

New York ERIC BENTLEY

[We should also like to add *The Spirit of Liberty*, the non-legal papers and addresses of Learned Hand, collected by Irving Dilliard (Knopf). — THE EDITORS.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 127, NUMBER 26, ISSUE 1987, WASHINGTON, D. C., DECEMBER 29, 1952

New Republic

LATTIMORE, VINCENT AND LOYALTY

DECEMBER 15 was Bill of Rights Day. True, it was not a holiday and there were no wild celebrations. But the day was not without its significance. It began appropriately enough with a brave little speech by President Truman. He warned against the belief that it is too dangerous to proclaim liberty throughout all the land to all the inhabitants. To deny freedom to those we disapprove of or disagree with is to embrace the methods and morals of Communism. Such hysterical disregard of the Bill of Rights, he said, would destroy the very ideals we are struggling to preserve.

At first the day seemed to draw strength and meaning from these noble words. Tom Clark read an opinion for the Supreme Court outlawing an Oklahoma loyalty oath statute. This statute required all state employees, including teachers, to swear that they do not belong to subversive organizations as listed by the Attorney General.

Clark, the author of the original list, said the fatal flaw in the statute was its failure to confine the oath to membership involving knowledge of the organization's subversive purpose. But it was quickly evident that the decision was not premised upon any abhorrence of the test oath technique, which history has demonstrated is so characteristic of political oppression. Rather the opinion did little more than set a verbal boundary for the permissible use of the test oath, a boundary that could easily be evaded by appropriate wording of the requirement. And so the bright sunshine of the day began to fade.

By the end of the day dark, angry clouds filled the sky. The State Department announced that its veteran official, John Carter Vincent, had been suspended following a decision by the President's Loyalty Review Board that "there is reasonable doubt as to his loyalty to the Government of the United States." His major crime, it seemed, was that in the course of his official duties he had engaged in "studied praise of Chinese Communists and equally studied criticism of the Chiang Kai-shek Government throughout a period when it was the declared and established policy of the Government of the United States to support Chiang Kai-shek's Government."

The gloomy clouds were still much in evidence the following day when a federal grand jury returned a seven-count perjury indictment against Owen Lattimore. It was alleged that he lied in testifying before Senator McCarran's Internal Security Subcommittee. And his alleged perjury concerned such monumental matters as whether he had reason to believe before 1950 that Ch'ao Ting-chi was a Communist and whether he lunched with Soviet Ambassador Oumansky before or after the Nazi invasion of Russia on June 22, 1941. More ominous and less clear was the assertion that he lied in denying that he had been "a sympathizer and promoter of Communism and Communist interests."

The Bill of Rights Day—1952—symbolized the double standard of libertarian morality which has so often characterized the Truman Administration. And it gave further evidence of the extent to which the cult of loyalty has gripped a fear-laden United States. The manner in which the Vincent and Lattimore cases unfolded and the flimsy nature of the revealed evidence against them suggest that the evils of that cult are not diminishing. Indeed, the accumulated forces of fear, reaction and political chicanery seem to be combining to produce a wild whirlwind of loyalism as 1952 draws to a close.

All of the events surrounding this one day assume significance against the background of a nation bent for the moment on political inquisitions, on ferreting out all those who have not hewn to traditional patterns of political and economic thought and action.

Whether in the form of loyalty oaths, loyalty hearings or Congressional investigations, the restraints on freedom are no less real and no less disrespectful of constitutional liberties. Always it is the person's mind, his way of thinking about political or economic matters, that is the target of action. Did he believe that his friend was a Communist? Did he agree with our official view toward China? Did he know or believe in the principles of the organization which he joined? Probe his thoughts and those of his friends. Make a guess as to what he knew or should have known a decade ago. Test his thoughts by what today is considered to be the right of way of thinking. Then render a judgment as to his loyalty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And if there is any inconsistency in his recollection of bygone events, consider calling a grand jury and getting a perjury indictment.

These are just some of the tragic but inevitable consequences of trying to combat Communism with an insistence upon a blind loyalty to the United States. There is and can be no workable definition of loyalty apart from that involved in the concepts of treason and espionage. The meaning of loyalty differs greatly among individuals, depending upon their own viewpoints and predilections. To attempt to adjudge the loyalty of others by such a personalized, fluid standard becomes an impossible task. It is only natural, therefore, that the process quickly degenerates into an inquiry into the individual's way of thinking and an adjudication based thereon. If the individual's pattern of thought falls within the boundaries recognized by the adjudicator as acceptable, he is considered loyal; otherwise he is found disloyal. But in the process freedom has been stripped of meaning. Freedom presupposes that one's way of thinking will remain immune from official inquiry or judgment. When that immunity is ripped away freedom perishes. Not even a finding that a person is loyal can replace the freedom that has been destroyed.

The lack of any rational test of loyalty breeds untold evils even apart from the loss of freedom. Since the procedural safeguards erected by the Constitution would not permit such aimless wanderings through the individual's mind, the safeguards have been made inapplicable. The ephemeral concept of national security has been invoked to enshroud the procedures with semi-secrecy, permitting the inquisitors to operate without any embarrassing judicial review. The adjudicators, acting as prosecutor and judge, are responsible to no one but themselves. That persons may be ruined physically, mentally and economically in the process of futilely pursuing the loyalty concept is of no moment to those responsible. A permanent badge of infamy may be pinned on an accused person without according him the procedural respect given the lowest form of criminal.

In the Congressional version of the loyalty inquisition, assistance of counsel is an empty formality. The individual can do nothing more than answer questions put to him by the committee. If he declines to answer by invoking the Fifth Amendment's self-incrimination protection, he is popularly branded as a Communist and permanently censured by the public. On the other hand, if he tries to answer honestly, he may become enmeshed in a series of inconsistencies and hazy recollections. A perjury indictment may then follow, especially if he appears on one of the long lists supplied by the Budenz-Bentley-Chambers trio.

And so the process goes on and on, each inequity building upon itself and acquiring its own rationalization in the minds of the inquisitors. The appalling wonder of it is that the festering sores of this disease have penetrated so far into the American way of life. There is little if any public outcry at these desecrations of human freedom. The legal profession, with notable exceptions, gives its studied acceptance to the program. Liberal legislators say little if anything about these matters. Even the courts have not been disposed to enter any serious objections.

Much of the responsibility for this melancholy state of affairs must be laid at the door of President Truman. It was he who refused to stand firm against the whining winds of fear and oppression. It was he who instituted the federal loyalty program, the most despicable encroachment on individual rights ever perpetrated by the federal government. Yet, at the same time, he has given admirable lip service to the cause of human freedom, his Bill of Rights Day speech being a notable example. This failure to give effective implementation to the ideals of the Bill of Rights may well constitute the unfortunate and unintended monument to the Truman Administration. Truman opened the dike to the flood waters of political oppression which are now upon us.

Whether the Eisenhower Administration will be able to stem the flood, even if it desires to do so, is doubtful. The assault on freedom is daily becoming more deadly, and it is ever more difficult to turn back to the ways of true freedom. Already a panel of experts has been established by the Republicans to make recommendations on the loyalty program to the new President. Other committees within the present executive and legislative frameworks are reported to be studying the entire loyalty-security programs. The very fact that such studies are being made is an indication of official uneasiness over the frightening implications of the cruel forces unleashed by Harry Truman's ineptitude.

But no real solution can be reached until it is realized that under the Bill of Rights the human mind is not a proper subject for official inquiry and adjudication. Freedom cannot be preserved by making so-called improvements or adjustments in the present loyalty program. There must be a wholly fresh approach to the problem, an appreciation that the Constitution contemplates and insists that free men be allowed to think and act and associate as they please as long as they commit no crime. If the Eisenhower Administration can discover and pursue such a new approach, it will be entitled to the eternal appreciation of all those who love and cherish human liberty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DuPONT EMPIRE ON TRIAL

by Richard S. Lewis

THE GOVERNMENT'S antitrust case against E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. (et al) is not only the biggest trust-busting action ever undertaken by the government but also the first major attack on the economic power of the nation's foremost industrial dynasty, the du Pont family.

On November 18, the du Pont brothers, Pierre and Irenee, accompanied by 33 attorneys, came to US Federal Judge Walter LaBuy's District Court in Chicago to hear what the government had to say.

Antitrust attorney Willis L. Hotchkiss branded them and their deceased brother, Lammot, the "architects and principal craftsmen" of a conspiracy to create the greatest industrial combination that has ever existed in private hands and use it to monopolize markets and restrain trade.

This combination, the government charged, consists mainly of the Du Pont Company, largest explosives and chemicals manufacturer in the US; the General Motors Corporation, largest manufacturing company in the nation and specifically the largest maker of automobiles and diesel locomotives; and the US Rubber Company, a principal tire maker.

Each company in this "trinity of motors, rubber and chemicals" has acquired a monopoly of the markets represented by the manufacturing needs of the other two, the government contends. General Motors, thus, has become the captive market of the Du Pont Company for paints and varnishes and of US Rubber for tires and tubes, and US Rubber is in turn a protected market for Du Pont products. To complete the round-robin, Du Pont and US Rubber tend to purchase their cars and trucks from General Motors exclusively.

At the head of this big, happy family is Pierre, 82, who as elder brother is pater familias of the diffuse, numerous and immensely wealthy du Pont clan with its 115 stockholding members, all of them defendants in the suit. They control the industrial trinity, says the government, through two family holding companies—the Christiana Securities Company and the Delaware Realty and Investment Corporation of Wilmington, Del. —and a family bank, the Wilmington Trust Co.

It was just as well that all of the defendants did not show up for trial, or the court might have had to adjourn to a place like the Chicago Stadium. Many of the family, however, will be called as witnesses during the eight months the trial is expected to take. They are reported to be scattered about the globe, from Cote D'Azur to the Indian Ocean, and subpoenas are going out early to bring them home.

On deck, though, Pierre and his younger brother, the 75-year-old Irenee, were ready, with their men-at-law, to defend the empire at its frontier in the federal court. They faced an old opponent, one the dynasty can be said to have grown up with, the United States. The government sheared off a part of their explosives dominion in 1907 in the "gunpowder trust suit." The du Ponts operated mainly in a single field then and that suit was a skirmish compared to the big offensive now before the court.

Today, the US seeks to break the family's grip on an industrial complex with which the economic life and common defense of the nation is firmly bound.

The government remedy is simplicity itself: that the family, its holding companies and the Du Pont Company be ordered to sell their stock in General Motors and in US Rubber and be enjoined forever from buying it back, so forcing each company "to stand on its own bottom and compete in the traditional American manner required by the Sherman Antitrust Act for access to the markets represented by the buying needs of the others."

The empire which the government thus proposes to dismember had its beginnings in the early years of the Republic. In the government's view, the present complex, with its fantastically intermeshed stockholdings, symbolizes the American dream shattering into a gigantic, Protean nightmare. How this came about will take months to tell in court. Basically, this is the government's case:

Eluethere Irenee du Pont came to the US with the gunpowder making techniques he had learned in the government munition plants of Napoleonic France, and without investing his own money, built a powder plant outside Wilmington in 1802. He sold preferred stock to six investors, but retained control of the common stock which carried control of the new enterprise, and so, within a few years, was able to buy out the investors with the company's profits.

One hundred years after Eleuthere's coup, the modern Du Pont Company came into being in a similar way. During the nineteenth century the company had been operated as a family partnership. In 1902 Eugene du

Richard Lewis, a reporter with the Chicago Sun-Times, is currently covering the du Pont trial in Chicago.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pont, then president, died and the surviving senior partners proposed to sell the company to their nearest competitor, the Laflin and Rand Powder Company.

In order to keep the business in the family, Alfred I. du Pont, a junior partner, worked out a reorganization plan by which he and two cousins, Pierre and T. Coleman du Pont, would take it over. They bought the assets of the company for $12 million in notes which were to be paid off from the earnings of the company. Then they bought out Laflin and Rand and a group of smaller powder companies, thus eliminating all major competition in the new and expanding field of smokeless powder. By 1907, the reorganized Du Pont Company controlled two-thirds of the black powder business, three-fourths of the dynamite business and all of the smokeless powder production in the US, according to the government.

A portion of the black powder and dynamite business was split off from the company in the "gunpowder trust" antitrust suit, but the company was allowed to keep its monopoly on smokeless powder on the theory that this was a military necessity.

At the outbreak of World War I, Great Britain, France and Russia turned to du Pont for smokeless powder, and the company struck its first great bonanza. It made contracts requiring the Allies to pay for plant expansion in advance. Amortization of the new plants was included in the price per pound. The government reported Du Pont profits zoomed from $5 million in 1914 to $57 million in 1915 and up to $82 million in 1916, dropping back to $43 million in 1918.

In 1915, Pierre and his brothers, Irenee and Lammot, moved to gain control of the fabulous powder enterprise. They formed a syndicate to buy out Cousin T. Coleman du Pont's controlling interest and financed the purchase, according to the government, with a loan from J. P. Morgan and Company.

The stock, the government says, was used as collateral for the loan which was ultimately paid off by income from the collateral. Purchase of T. Coleman's interest was made at a price of $14 million through a holding company which became the Christiana Securities Company, the instrument of control in the Du Pont Company ever since.

Girded by war profits, the du Ponts turned to new fields. The company began to buy $25 million worth of stock in General Motors and Chevrolet in 1917. By the spring of 1918, it had acquired enough stock, according to the government, to take charge of General Motors' finances. The du Pont invasion of General Motors, the government continues, followed an understanding with William C. Durant, founder of General Motors, that the du Pont and Durant interests would control the automobile company as partners. "It is clear, however, that from the very beginning of this relationship," the government charges, "the du Pont group was planning on ousting Durant when the opportunity was ripe and on taking over sole and complete control of General Motors."

In the spring of 1920, the du Ponts launched a $65 million expansion program for General Motors. J. P. Morgan and Company, the du Pont bankers, underwrote a new stock issue. When financing was completed the market price of General Motors stock slumped. By the fall of 1920, Durant was in serious difficulties and "suddenly and with significant unanimity" Durant's brokers began calling for more margin. Durant could not furnish it. The du Ponts arranged with J. P. Morgan to purchase Durant's entire stock interest in General Motors, and set up Du Pont Securities Company to handle the deal. In exchange for his 2.5 million shares of GM stock, Durant received a 40-percent interest in the new securities company. The du Ponts next purchased Durant's 40-percent interest for 230,000 shares of GM stock. The result was that the securities company, which the du Ponts now owned, held the Durant block of GM stock and the du Ponts thus became the masters of General Motors.

The government charges that one of the expected benefits of this acquisition was a Du Pont Company monopoly of General Motors' paint, varnish and other chemical needs. The government's exhibits show that in 1921, the Du Pont sales director reported that the Pyralin Sheeting (celluloid) Division of Du Pont was supplying all of General Motors' requirements in this material, and in 1923, the Du Pont executive committee was advised that all leather substitute and top material purchased by General Motors came from Du Pont's Fabrikoid Division.

When General Motors' Fisher Body Division resisted Du Pont's sales pressure and insisted on buying paint and varnish from competitors, Lammot fired a sizzling letter to Fred Fisher.

"In view of the stock ownership relations between Fisher Body, Flint [a paint and varnish subsidiary of Du Pont] General Motors and Du Pont," Lammot wrote, "it would seem that Flint should enjoy a large part if not all of Fisher Body's paint and varnish business, unless there is some good reason for not having it."

Fisher ignored the remonstrance, the government noted that the Fisher brothers were in a strong position of executive independence at the time, and Du Pont was forced to give Fisher Body a secret discount. The dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

count continued until the Fishers sold their 500,000 shares of General Motors stock, which was purchased jointly by Du Pont and General Motors' German subsidiary, the Opel Motors group, in 1931. When the Fishers got out, the discount ended.

Through its control of General Motors, Du Pont was able to exploit two great chemical discoveries of GM's noted research chief, D. F. Kettering, and his staff, the government charges, for example the discovery of tetraethyl lead, which Kettering's men developed as an antiknock in 1922, and the manufacture of which Du Pont immediately preempted. The company was later forced to share production of the highly profitable compound with the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, which found a cheaper manufacturing process. In 1930, Kettering's research crew developed the non-toxic refrigerant, Freon 12, for GM's Frigidaire Division. Du Pont, the government says, ordered GM to discontinue research on production processes and leave that problem to Du Pont. Kinetic Chemicals, Incorporated, was organized to produce the refrigerant, with Du Pont holding 51 percent of the stock and General Motors, 49 percent.

Kettering's talented team was hard at work on synthetic rubber in 1927 when Du Pont found out about it and questioned whether "it was a wise expenditure of money on the part of General Motors to go into a synthetic rubber investigation." General Motors dropped the synthetic rubber investigation, the government says, under the pressure of Du Pont's opposition. Du Pont contended that it was looking into the matter, with its much vaster laboratory facilities.

Ten years after the du Ponts invaded General Motors the restless empire makers made a new surge, this time in the direction of US Steel Corporation. They bought 114,000 shares of US Steel common stock, and the purchase loosed a torrent of reports that steel was about to be added to the Du Pont dominion. The move attracted the attention of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission. Not long after these agencies began to look into it, the du Ponts sold the steel stock. Then they moved in another direction.

Irenee du Pont and a group of associates formed a syndicate to buy control of the US Rubber Company. Eight of the syndicate members were also members of Pierre's family and subscribed to nearly two-thirds of the syndicate purchase, according to the government. Another four were family members who held stock in the Christiana Securities Company, the holding company which holds the controlling interest in the Du Pont Company. These subscriptions brought to 97 percent the du Pont family share of the stock purchased, according to the government. The US Rubber stock buying began in 1927. By the spring of 1928, the syndicate began dumping large blocks of its holdings on the market, repeating this operation during the summer. This dumping, the government contends, broke the price of US Rubber stock from 45 to 30.

When the dumping ceased, new capital stock was issued by US Rubber, and the syndicate bought it at prices substantially below what the syndicate had paid in its first plunge, the government says.

At the beginning of 1929, the syndicate took over control of US Rubber and replaced its president, Charles B. Seger, with a Du Pont man, Francis B. Davis Jr. As in the case of General Motors a decade before, it was understood between Du Pont and US Rubber that the new satellite would become another market for Du Pont products. By way of illustration, the government relates that one day on a tour of inspection, Lammot saw a paint can of a competitor in the US Rubber building.

It was on the windowsill in plain view. Lammot demanded an explanation from the company's new president, Davis. As the government exhibits show, Davis had one. He replied that the painters had been using a Pratt and Lambert paint can, no doubt of it. But the can had Du Pont paint in it. "Because," he added, "we told him [the contractor] that he could not have the contract unless he used Du Pont paints. He told us that on this basis, he would not be able to maintain the price he quoted on the contract, so we bought the paint through our own purchasing department to be sure none but our products were used." The government brief comments: "The whole pattern of the relationship between Du Pont and US Rubber is epitomized in this letter."

Four years after Du Pont acquired control of US Rubber, the government charges, the rubber company entered into contracts with General Motors on new equipment tires. The contracts provided that US Rubber would furnish the tires at prices lower than prices it charged other auto makers. US Rubber concealed this preferential treatment by billing General Motors at prices comparable to those in the industry and kicking back the difference between the contract price and the billing price, the government says.

In such ways, charges the government, the du Pont empire has sought to restrict markets and restrain trade. The empire has grown for 150 years until now its industrial power has become co-extensive with a large segment of the industrial power of the nation.

Whether such power, born in the nineteenth century and grown mighty in the first half of the twentieth, can endure under the law is the focus of the action at Chicago.

The Charles Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CANDID THOUGHTS ON NON-VIOLENCE

IN A WORLD rapidly dividing along color lines, the Union of South Africa assumes an importance dwarfing even that she holds by virtue of rich gold deposits and a position astride the alternative route from West to East. South Africa has become the test of European ability to adapt to a new relationship of equality of opportunity and harmonious co-operation with those who were once slaves.

Europeans in South Africa comprise roughly one-sixth of the population; they have exploited this fact to excuse every measure of oppression practiced upon the native and Asiatic population. One-half century of such oppression culminated in a crisis which, in May and June, brought the nation close to civil war—but civil war between whites. Startling? No.

In 1860 a shortage of plantation laborers caused the importation of Indians. From 1885 to this day a series of laws has restricted their freedom until they stand divested of all civil rights. And that has been the pattern: use 'em, but lock 'em up.

Shortly after formation of the Union in 1910 native Africans were in effect banished to reserves comprising 7.3 percent of the total land—the poorest land. But industrial development has forced South Africa to seek cheap and abundant labor. Consequently, Premier Daniel Malan seeks a policy providing complete segregation while allowing the exploitation of native labor.

When the natives were removed from the common roles in 1936, the Cape Coloreds were given every assurance that no such fate awaited them. The immediate cause of this last crisis is a series of apartheid *laws which culminated in the disenfranchisement of the Cape Coloreds. Until this law, South Africa was presumed to have a constitution. But if a bare parliamentary majority elected by a minority could enact whatever law pleased it for the avowed purpose of rigging the next election—Coloreds have normally voted with the United Party, in opposition to Malan whose majority is so slim that these few votes, some 8 percent of the total, could erase it—the Constitution was a mockery. The white Opposition appealed to the courts which ruled the law unconstitutional. Malan set up a "High Court of Parliament" to overrule the court. But the intensity of crisis throughout the land forced him to submit to a new ruling. In January, however, Malan will push two bills through Parliament—one providing for detention camps, the other for arrest without warrant, and he has in mind other measures which will be discussed in a later NR report.*

Years of oppression have also affected a degree of reconciliation among several elements of the native, Asiatic and Colored population. For example, the African National Congress, formed in 1912 to fight for extension of political rights to the African, has joined with the similar South African Indian Congress in a "Defiance of Unjust Laws Campaign." Their tactic is "passive resistance," organized in South Africa by Mahatma Ghandi in 1895 to protest oppression of Indians. On December 8, his son, Manilal Ghandi, was arrested along with Patrick Duncan, son of the first South African Governor-General of the Union, for entering a native reserve without permits. With them were four other whites.

The author of the following discussion of "passive resistance" is a man beloved by both white and black people for his selfless devotion to both. He will be familiar to all those who read Allan Paton's Cry The Beloved Country *as the Superintendent of an educational settlement for the blind and the deaf described in Chapter 13.*

by Arthur W. Blaxall

"THE Defiance of Unjust Laws Campaign" is the official title for a movement organized in South Africa by a joint planning Council composed of representatives of the African National Congress and the South African Indian Congress. While new in form it is by no means a new idea. For many years I have heard non-Europeans of a thoughtful nature discuss the technique of passive resistance, even at times using the Indian name Satyagraha. There is little point in discussing whether there is a significance in the new name because as long as it is a non-violent movement it belongs to the same form of struggle as that developed by Mahatma Gandhi.

In this article I do not attempt to argue on the ethics of non-violent resistance, nor the wisdom of the campaign in the realm of practical politics. I am myself convinced that any individual whose conscience revolts against certain legislation is entitled to express his conviction by refusing to obey the law if he is prepared to suffer the consequences. I am, therefore, satisfied in my own mind that there is ample ground in South Africa for peoples of all races to defy various laws on the Statute Book. As I say, it is a matter for the individual conscience, but when such a mental attitude is deliberately cultivated and trained it is natural that those who love peace above all things, and loathe violence in any form should carefully examine the organization before they give it support either morally or practically. I have, therefore, had to ask myself a number of questions which I shall endeavor to enumerate as follows.

1. *To what extent is the Movement in South Africa one of the people?* Personally I am prepared to say I am surprised that as many as 7,000 have already volunteered

Arthur W. Blaxall is the Secretary of the Christian Council of South Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and most of them have gone to jail, but 7,000 is still a very small number in a non-white population approaching nine million. In the middle of October the figures were given: Eastern Cape—5,269; Western Cape, Mafeking and Kimberley—306; Transvaal—1,116; Natal—152; Free State—147. Among the Africans it must be admitted that the response has been almost entirely in urban areas and from a particular group of people, namely the growing number of politically conscious urbanized Africans. Moving as I do among Africans of the humbler type who live very close to the bread line but greatly love such homes as they have, I am bound to admit that I see very little likelihood that mass defiance of a non-violent nature will be understood by the majority, especially in areas where the majority are still very close to primitive patterns of life.

I do not feel I know enough of the Indian groups to gauge how far this campaign is supported by the majority of them. It is evident that in most places they have not yet volunteered in large numbers, but it is known, of course, that Natal and Durban, in particular, are the home of passive resistance in South Africa. In Durban most groups include more Indians than Africans.

The Colored community presents a very interesting group so far as this movement is concerned. In South Africa the term "Colored" is used only for persons of mixed parentage. There are about a million in the Union, three quarters of whom live in and around Cape Town where they are an ordered, cultured community living in every way similar lives to people of an equal economic standing in other countries. My 15 years residence in the Cape Peninsula always led me to think that the Colored people would try desperately to hang on to the coat tails of the white people, but recent legislation, enforcement of social apartheid in places it has never been known, has undoubtedly shaken them. Although it is probably true to say they have not so far associated themselves in any large number with this campaign, I have heard nothing but interest and admiration from Colored people with whom I have discussed the matter. Edgar Brookes in his book *The Colour Problems of South Africa,* published nearly a quarter of a century ago, wrote that as in the realm of the blind a one-eyed man is king, so in the racial struggle in South Africa the Colored people may yet prove the natural leaders. There are little signs of it at present, in fact economic conditions make Colored people peculiarly afraid of African development, but when the change comes ———! Already I have heard several Colored men of standing say that they are being steadily forced to common cause with Indians and Africans.

2. *Can this movement in South Africa be called a spiritual movement, or is it merely an attempt to secure political advantage?* This again is a difficult question. Twice I discussed it in the first six months of this year with Manilal Gandhi, who should be in a position to judge this issue. I gained the impression that at the beginning of the year he was very doubtful, but of late, from correspondence and articles in *Indian Opinion,* I gather he is impressed with the movement although still critical. It is not without interest that from the beginning the organizers have encouraged the people to observe days of prayer, and although it may be possible to criticize this, it must be admitted that it indicates some measure of spirituality. It has been said again and again that the campaign has broken out because the non-Europeans are desperate and have no other way of expressing the fact that they are frustrated beyond endurance. To this must be replied that frustration has either spiritual influence, or an utterly demoralizing one. If it is spiritual influence it produces character which can go to great lengths as the world knows from the life of Mahatma Gandhi and others in other places. To me indications are not lacking that this campaign in South Africa is a spiritual development but I am still waiting to see it consolidate into a steady movement educating the masses to disciplined character development.

3. *Leadership*: In both white and non-white circles I have noticed that many who might have been expected to sympathize with the campaign are very cautious because they believe it to be largely organized, and the technique inspired, by people who are named under the Suppression of Communism Act as former members of the Party. It is obviously impossible for anyone who is not a Congress member, and even for the majority of members, to know the extent of such influence. It is impossible to deny that some members of the action committee are "named" persons, but now that the numbers participating in the campaign run into thousands, it is difficult to believe that a relatively small group can wield such power. As it seems to me the movement has grown by the spiritual force of the non-violence which has been maintained. Many who were skeptical at the beginning have stopped to think. And in many cases thought has led to personal action. It is the type of strength which grows by realization of itself; power of this nature will not be intimidated by threats of severer punishment. There is very little of accepted Communistic technique in this so it does not look to me as if the few "named" persons exercise any influence out of proportion to their numbers.

4. *Inevitably there are strong* vocal criticisms both of the organization and of the conduct of the campaign. I

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have taken pains to examine two criticisms in particular and give my conclusions for what they may be worth.

(a) It is said that in most cases it is a misnomer to talk about volunteers, that by assured support for the relatives of any who may go to jail unemployed people have taken part in large number. I am told on the best authority that while it is true some of the volunteers have been unemployed at the time on no occasion has there been coercion, and in any case the maintenance support given to dependents is so slight that under no circumstances can it be called a temptation to those who endure the very real discomforts of prison life.

(b) The more serious charge is that there is little leadership among the Africans and that they are entirely led by Indians. This is a serious thing for anyone to say without evidence which I personally do not think exists. I know some leading Africans have refused to take part in the movement, but on the other hand many of those who are risking a good deal are men and women of high standing, and quite definitely not the type who would be influenced by anyone. It is a very serious thing in South Africa when people in responsible positions try to insinuate racial jealousies and antipathies which do not exist, or, if they do, are due to other factors which can be dealt with in their own sphere. Few things are more diabolical than a whispered campaign, a practice which has become all too common in South Africa.

5. *Has the campaign so far justified itself?* From several sides I have heard that even if it should be decided to close the campaign as such and dissolve the organization, leaving individuals to do as they may decide, the sufferings of those who have been in jail and beaten are fully justified by the fact that the non-European people have realized the power they possess even without resort to any sort of violence. That worldwide interest has been expressed has also greatly encouraged them, although the more intelligent leaders feel embarrassment when some well-intended friends overseas express themselves rather crudely, and are influenced by superficial knowledge of life in South Africa. However, there can be no question that non-European people in South Africa know that the moral support of freedom-loving peoples is behind them in their struggle to develop.

6. *There are weaknesses* which are inevitable. To many white people one of the most regrettable things is the fact that in their published program the African National Congress included in the list of unjust laws the Legal Regulations with regard to Cattle Limitation and certain matters concerning the use of land. It is realized that a large number of Africans still think and live in what is called "cattle economy," but it cannot honestly be denied that the right use of the land is the very life blood of South Africa so that regulations about cattle do not come into the same category of discrimination as other social and economic distinctions. I personally know a number of white people whose thinking has been influenced by this campaign in general but who have refused to admit any moral support because of this particular section in the program. These people are fully aware of the answer given by Africans, namely, that it is not overstocking which is the evil, but lack of sufficient land in the Reserves. This land hunger is acknowledged as the root of much trouble, but it does not alter the serious fact that much of the land now available for exclusive African occupation is denuded, and rapidly turning to desert owing to ill use and grazing stock which is of no real value. The inclusion of this problem in the list of unjust laws has complicated the issue and done much to alienate real friends of African development. The complexity of this problem is an outstanding example of the need for consultation and a program of patient education.

Finally, the question is asked as to how far this movement can continue non-violent, or whether it will continue at all. This is not the place to prophesy, and I prefer in this article to be content with the statement of my "Candid Thoughts" as enumerated previously. The situation is undoubtedly very tense and calls for statesmanship of a high order both on the side of the government and among non-European leaders. The time has come once again for the Congress to hold their annual meetings and discuss this important subject. As everyone knows first steps are being taken in preparation for the general election next year, when, no doubt, candidates for Parliament will be expected to say how they propose to handle this situation if it develops.

In other parts of Africa there are deep problems with regard to the way multi-racial society can be built up, and peaceably maintained. The fact that the eyes of the world are upon South Africa is a factor in life which cannot be ignored, but it must be faced that this country is only the highlight of a wider problem. Looking out with the mind of a simple citizen who desires nothing other than freedom of opportunity to serve God, and being in peace and harmony with one's neighbors I am bound to admit grave concern, and yet as a Christian I dare not despair.

The first need, it seems to me, is for the restoration of faith and goodwill in South Africa. At present we are divided as never before, although it is also probably true that there are more small groups which step over all restrictions than there has ever been.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the meanwhile those who, in the words of Scripture, "seek peace and pursue it," are sorely taxed to know how and where a beginning can be made. That Dr. Malan and Dr. Moroka should sit down together is, alas, unthinkable, but sooner or later those whom they represent will have to do so.

News was in the press recently that it is the intention of the great Dutch Reformed Church to convene a conference in 1953 during which church leaders, white and black, can face together their tasks as Christians. Details are not yet available, but the very suggestion, coming from that particular source, opens a new window of hope. Is it possible for those same church leaders to hammer out a program by which (a) all political parties would agree to refrain from provocative utterances and actions in the field of race relations, until the conclusions reached by the conference of church leaders are known, and (b) the leaders of the two Congresses to suspend the work of their Defiance Action Committee for the same period of time?

Such thoughts may appear airy, puerile dreams, lacking in all form of realism. In desperate situations men grasp at straws, so in a situation as tense and fraught with danger as that which confronts our country today it behooves every man and woman to think the matter through, refusing to believe that there is no solution.

"WAS IT BETTER UNDER HITLER?"

by Anne Fremantle

THE VICTORY at the German polls of Hitler's old friend, Wilhelm Schepman, last chief of the Storm Troopers, served notice on the United States that the Neo-Nazis had arrived, or that the Nazis had returned. The Neo-Nazis won easily in Lower Saxony, as they had previously won in Schleswig Holstein, where the Minister President, Dr. Walter Bartram is a former Nazi official and whose deputy President and Minister of Finance, Waldemar Kraft, is an ex-captain in the SS. Kraft was manager in the Reich Government for agriculture in German-occupied Poland; now he is leader of the Schleswig Holstein refugees, as Schepman is of those of Lower Saxony.

A major cause in returning these Nazis to power is unemployment. Hundreds of young people, until 1945 busy, well-fed and well-trained, today have idle hands and hearts. They are the unwanted; they have too much free time on their hands. No one woos them. No one flatters them, as Hitler did, day in day out for 13 years, telling them they were the master race, the apex of man's long struggle to arrive at Man. Then too, into a Germany rumped by the Allies, have come a further 10 million expellees, and more are coming daily. These are hungrier, leaner, bitterer, than the Reich Germans. They are more able to "take" discomfort and horrible conditions. Many of them do not even speak German. These refugees form 38 percent of the population of Schleswig Holstein, 30 percent of that of Lower Saxony, for example. Over all Germany, more than a third of the unemployed come from the refugee group, although it forms only 16.5 percent of the population. In Schleswig Holstein there are 1,200,000 refugees, and a native population of 1,500,000. Both are crowded into an area with no industries, where the land is poor and where Nazism was always very strong. Little wonder that Schleswig Holstein has voted in a totally Nazi government, and Lower Saxony also, in spite of the fact that the index of German production is today 159 percent of what it was in 1936, while German exports have increased seven times in the past four years and 75 percent in 1951.

The Reich Germans, who not unnaturally resent the huge influx of jobless, homeless people, do not seem to realize that these are Hitler's chickens coming home to roost—grown, perhaps, strangely like vultures. For it was to these people of German blood, and for these, that Hitler screamed during 13 years: these are the Germans whom he said must come home, every man, woman and child. But whereas he saw Germany spreading out to include and incorporate them, instead, Russia has spewed them out and sent them crawling home to a shrunken Germany: Czechs, Poles, Hungarians, Ukrainians, Rumanians, Bessarabians, Dantzigers, Latvians, Letts and Lithuanians, all proclaim in their persons the terrible turns of fortune's wheel! Quite obviously these expellees have nowhere else to go. Yet how can the Reich Germans ever completely trust either individuals or families, still less whole ethnic groups, who have lived for generations, sometimes for centuries, in a totally alien culture, with a different mother tongue, and who, for the past quarter century, have been living under Communism, daily indoctrinated? And how can the Russians ever again trust anyone of German stock, tongue or sympathy? Not only the Russian war casualties but the nearly five million Russian prisoners of war tortured and killed by the Germans are too permanently dead. It is as though having won a war against Russia, the US expelled all its citizens of Russian, Polish or satellite ancestry, sending them back into a Russia reduced to the

Anne Fremantle, whose writings are published in many periodicals, is associate editor of Commonweal. A second article by her, describing the resurgence of Fascism in Italy will appear next week.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pre-Peter, the Great boundaries! Little wonder the whole 10 million expellees, whatever their individual feelings, are Mother Carey's chickens even more than Hitler's, and are stormy petrels where they come from, where they are now, and wherever they may go.

The young German unemployed, watching the coal wagons leaving Germany daily filled with reparation coal, have plenty of time to remember the 13 fat years of outings, hostels, rallies, good food, constant occupation, and, above all, of limitless hope. Little wonder all agree "it was better then." When Gen. Ernst Otto Remer, the Neo-Nazi leader, rhetorically asks at his meetings, "Were not things better under Hitler?" the answer, every time, carried to the rafters, is a resounding "Ja." As early as 1949, the Nazi slogan was "Germany, freed from her chains, must find her old frontiers and recover the territories stolen from here," and their slogan was "Speak German to the invader" (i.e., the US, British, French and USSR troops). Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, recently United States Assistant High Commissioner for Germany, said on returning to the United States that although "Communism has been thoroughly rejected at the polls, national extremism and Neo-Nazism all too evidently still have an appeal . . . there are distressing signs of both self-pity and arrogant pride." He added that "all Germans, even today, should have a feeling of collective shame," which is most conspicuously absent. Though this is, it must be said, regretted by the better and more thoughtful Germans. Only Adenauer himself, and speaking for himself, has had the courage publicly to apologize for Nazi atrocities and actions: and, as one girl said to me, "He is absolutely alone. Right or wrong, he is a great statesman, but a lonely one. He has no imitators, and will have no successor."

Gen. Ernst Otto Remer, who sprang into prominence at the time of the July 20, 1944, Putsch against Hitler, would distinguish between National Socialism and Nazism, and his followers call themselves National Socialists, never abbreviating the name to Nazi. The theory is sound, he declares: the Nazis, as people, made mistakes. Remer's party is called the *Sozialistische Reichspartei*, or SRP. His own share in the *Putsch* of 1944 is still obscure: some of the survivors insist he too was one of the conspirators, but that, by pure fluke, in telephoning to headquarters to find out if the *coup* had succeeded, he was switched on to Goebbels himself and later was the first person to talk to Hitler. He was rewarded for his loyalty by immediate elevation in military rank. Later General Remer tracked down the Putsch conspirators so mercilessly that even the Nazis said he "smelt of corpses" and it was suggested that he did so out of personal anxiety lest he be implicated. His followers wear the brown shirt and tie of the Nazis, but he has substituted the black Prussian eagle for the swastika. His fiefs are the same as Hitler's: the largely rural areas of Oldenburg, Luneburg, Friesland and Ems. The Lutherans are almost without exception pro-Remer: geographically, the Catholic areas, such as those around Osnabruck and Hildesheim, are against him. Nazism, unlike Fascism, which remained middle-class, drew great strength from the German peasants. As P. W. Wenger, a German journalist, has remarked: "The German peasant is a man of things; democracy is a matter of ideas." And he goes on to say that it is the *actuality* of the British Monarchy, the personal devotion of the English to their perfectly concrete King, which has saved England from Nazism. He adds: "Moscow too, arrives at her power over industrial states by the conquest of agrarian peoples, such as the Balkans and China. And, as Moscow is least secure among industrialized folk, such as the Czechs, so Nazism is least strong in Berlin, strongest in Schleswig Holstein and in Saxony, almost wholly agricultural areas."

General Remer's top men are Count Wolf von Westarp, an unemployed journalist who lost an arm fighting, and Dr. Fritz Dorls, a 41-year old doctor of philosophy. Von Westarp took over the leadership while Remer spent four months in jail for insulting Dr. Adenauer. Wolfgang Hedler, a deputy of the Bonn Parliament, is another of Remer's henchmen. Recently, at Einfeld, in Schleswig Holstein, he stated that, "The German Resistance were traitors and good for nothing, and any German who took part in the July 20, 1944, Putsch against the Führer betrayed their country. In this war the German people were not vanquished. Perhaps Hitler was wrong to send six million Jews to the gas chamber, but, one way or another, the Jews had to be liquidated." Amid frantic applause, the orator was hauled off to court, but the court acquitted him. Crowned with laurels, a cortege of honor carried him in triumph through cheering streets to his hotel.

General Remer himself has claimed that, "We of Lower Saxony are the Prussians of the twentieth century. We stand for the reunification of the Reich." It is easy to see why every reference to the "traitors" of the 1944 Putsch is eagerly taken up: at the end of World War I, the Germans insisted that it was their own revolting Navy which occasioned their defeat, and not the victorious Allies. Now today again it is not only the Nazis who are saying it was treason from within, and not the invading armies, which caused the fall of the thousand-year Reich. While the wish to identify with their own traitors may seem strange, it is obvious that to insist that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only Germans can defeat Germany, that no outside enemy can conquer her, is balm-in-Gilead to a defeated people. And it is certainly true that of 17 Field Marshals alive at the beginning of the war, 10 were disgraced during its course, three were implicated in the 1944 plot and were killed, and two died in combat. Of 36 Generals, 26 were removed during the course of the war, three were executed by Hitler and seven died.

In the schools today the children of the (to us) heroes of the Putsch, of those men who, faithful to the "other Germany" died to defeat Hitler, are discriminated against by their schoolfellows as much as by the teachers. And the Putsch widows and dependents—there are over 5,000 of them—are having a hard time getting their husbands' and parents' property back through the courts since everything they possessed was confiscated at the time of the executions. Contrariwise, those Nazis condemned to jail sentences, such as Arnold Speer, are considered suffering martyrs, and Spandau, the prison where several of them are serving out their terms, has become a place of pilgrimage. "Poor Herr Speer, we Germans find it very hard to understand the reasons for his conviction" a most respectable lawyer said to me about one of the men proven by the Nuremberg Court to have been guilty of the mass employment of slave-labor!

Even so anti-Nazi a writer as the Catholic poetess Gertrud von le Fort, voiced a common attitude when she sighed to a Jewish friend, forced to flee after her parents and every relative had been gassed and their property confiscated, and who had recently returned after 12 years of exile, "Oh, you people who were lucky enough to get out, you have no idea how much we who had to remain suffered!" Yet, actually, during the war, until the Allied bombings, life in Germany was, for the average citizen, better than before. And for children and young people it was more than ordinarily golden, so that if today life utterly belies the promises Hitler made in its name, the average young German can hardly be blamed if he thinks this is not Hitler's fault! Anyone reading the memoirs, diaries, or letters, whether of pro-Nazis, like Schacht or of soi-disant anti-Nazis, like von Hassell, or von Witzleben, must be astonished at the normalcy of life depicted therein as compared with, say, English or French life at the same date. Officials, even minor ones, could—and did—travel with their wives, and often left them comfortably installed in Paris or basking in Rome as did, for example, Herr Struve while busy in Poland.

Today in Germany all the best-selling books are Nazi: conversations with Goering, the table-talk of Hitler, the life of Rommel. The ordinary German cannot understand why the rest of the world should blame the Nazi leaders: they were beaten, sure, but so what? The idea that guilt could ever be incurred by anyone simply obeying orders is foreign to the German temperament. Those Nazis who succeeded in escaping to Spain are much applauded: "See," I was told, "how today the United States courts Franco. Franco has helped these Nazis; they are his friends: when he becomes America's friend, these his friends will be her friends also." Now the McCarran Act, while forbidding Communists and former Communists entry to the USA will permit the entry of Nazis, Fascists and Falangists. Four thousand Nazis are raring to come here and become eligible to do so on Christmas Eve.

Today the mark is the second most stable currency in Europe, and never in their history have all Germans, and all Austrians, irrespective of class or age, been collectively so well off physically, that is, earned higher wages, or been able with them to buy more or better food. But spiritually the German peoples are very sick. Into the empty room, vacated by the removal of the single devil of Hitler, and broomswept by the occupation, are crowded at least five other devils: unemployment; over-population; the influx of alien refugees; the reliance on blackmail "if you won't give us the moon, we'll get it from the Russians"; and Neo-Nazism. And of those, the last is the most powerful. Nor is it necessarily an anti-Communist movement. Every one of today's Nazis knows many others who have "moved over" into the Eastern zone—for example, the actual torturers, executioners and confidence men of Nazi days—and who are busy working at their old jobs. Several anti-Nazis told me they did not dare visit either Berlin or Vienna, as several who did had disappeared. Their movements had been reported from one zone to the other, and "if such people venture to the big cities they have only themselves to blame for what happens to them when they get there," they agreed.

Every day Western Germany gets stronger. Whereas France and Italy have received *no new aid allocations under the Marshall Plan for over eight months*, Western Germany has been getting her monthly allocations on the dot. And Neo-Nazism grows with the country's recovery, is well-organized and has serious leaders. Yet today it has a more formidable opposition than in Nazi days. For then, to vote Nazi was to vote for something positive: to vote against, or to abstain, was to vote for what? Possibly Communism, most certainly anarchy. Today there is, albeit embryonic, a "Policy for the West," and the outline of a Western European Union.

Italian Neo-Fascism which I shall review next week is less well-organized, but is more widely felt. The current strength of both Neo-Fascism and Neo-Nazism indicate that a change of head is not enough, even if that head is cut off. What is essential is a change of heart.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POINT FOUR AND THE BATTLE FOR ASIA

IV. INDO-CHINA—LIBERTY, EQUALITY AND FRATERNITY?

by Clarence Decker

In East Asia, parallels 40° and 20° have common troubles. If a Communist-controlled Korea would point like a dagger at Japan, a Communist-dominated Indo-China, poised like a giant Oriental scimitar, could cut a wide swathe through rich and strategic Southeast Asia.

There were times during my recent trip to Indo-China when I thought I was in the midst of a full-scale war—fighters and bombers zooming overhead, mortar fire resounding day and night from the environs of Saigon and Hanoi, city streets and country roads clogged with soldiers, restricted areas, curfews. . . . Guards accompanied our party on trips to villages and refugee camps in the fighting areas. The French Generals and civilian officials with whom we talked seemed optimistic of victory in the relatively near future. Few native Viet-Namese shared their optimism.

The ultimate implications of the Indo-China war seem clear, but the present character of the conflict is complex and confusing, especially to Americans who—at least prior to the Communist capture of China and the Korean invasion—lived in splendid isolation from the problems of Southeast Asia. Part of our ignorance about Indo-China stems from our almost complete absorption in Europe's problems, but another part undoubtly derives directly from France's colonial policy. For almost a century French paternalism has been so exclusive that Indo-China has been aptly described as a French "balcony on the Pacific."

The balcony was raised in 1858 when a French fleet anchored off Saigon, ostensibly to protect persecuted French missionaries. By the turn of the century French hegemony was complete. Although often enlightened in economic and social matters, France actually contributed little to the preparation of her colony for independence. Her culture touched only the educated classes, ignored native talent and industry, and failed to raise the mass living standard appreciably.

Throughout the war, underground resistance to the Japanese was fed by the spirit of independence. The Viet-Minh League, led by the Communist-trained Ho Chi-minh, provided the inspiration and the guidance. In August, 1945, following Japanese surrender, Ho Chi-minh quickly proclaimed his country's independence and formed a provisional government with wide support. Between this government and the French, negotiations commenced but soon foundered. Mutually suspicious, both sides broke the uneasy truce. Five years later—at the end of 1951—more than 30,000 Union troops, composed of French, Legionnaires, Moroccans, Algerians and Senegalese, had lost their lives, including some of the best officer material. The war had cost the French about one billion dollars a year. For Indo-China the costs cannot be even assessed.

In Indo-China, perhaps more than in any other Southeast Asia country, the battle against Communism centers on the economic and spiritual life of the masses of the people. A preliminary step toward regeneration was taken in 1950 when the United States, in co-operation with the French and the Indo-Chinese, established a technical and economic mission in the country. During the past year, under the Mutual Security Agency, approximately $25 million has been spent for economic weapons. Some 50 men and women—comprising a mobile team of agricultural specialists, doctors, engineers, financial experts and teachers—are now fighting the ignorance, disease and poverty threatening Indo-China's existence. Our investment has bought penicillin, steel hoes, prefabricated hospitals, electric generators, water pumps, surgical instruments, fertilizer and other materials.

One of its most exciting projects is the reconstruction of the Communist-destroyed Sontay Irrigation System, which provides the basic diet of rice for hundreds of thousands of people. Watching the farmers diligently rehabilitating their canals, now flowing with water, I could understand a little better the phenomenal improvement of civilian morale in this war-torn area and the enthusiastic appreciation of formerly skeptical people for this tangible proof of the white man's interest in their problem.

Above all, while war continues, our help has gone to refugees. Herman Holiday, MSA's Relief and Rehabilitation Chief in Indo-China, personifies United States friendship to thousands of these pitiful, innocent victims of the global war. The 36-year-old Negro from Indianapolis—now carrying the ball from Saigon to Hanoi instead of on Tuskegee's gridiron—still measures up to All-American standards. Six-foot four-inch "Big Her-

Dr. Clarence R. Decker, President of the University of Kansas City, recently toured Southeast Asia as Assistant Director of the Mutual Security Agency in charge of the Far Eastern program. This is the fourth of a series of seven articles which constitute his report.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man" towers high above the small-statured Indo-Chinese, but the weary, sick and homeless who see him hard at work in their villages know his heart fits into his giant stature. Mortar fire doesn't stop Herman from getting calico, rice, canned milk and other relief goods to the needy—his "clients" as he calls them. His faith and concern for justice are giving the people the will to live—the determination to fight for their freedom.

One day Herman had to bring me home, ill and exhausted, from a strenuous inspection trip into the country. I was pretty well discouraged by what seemed the insuperable obstacles we faced. I shall never forget Herman at my bedside bolstering my hope with stirring accounts of the great intangible gains that had already been made, and with warm, human stories about stricken families whose lives had been rehabilitated.

Nor will I soon forget young Dr. Warren Winkelstein, leading the fight against malaria, yaws, leprosy and other diseases of the Far East, where life does not begin at 40, but usually ends at 38. Together we visited villages to see a few of the hundreds of newly established dispensaries and sanitary community wells; to inspect typical aspects of the health-education program now serving almost a million people; and to watch trained Viet-Namese nurses treating patients suffering from the painful and blinding disease of trachoma. In some areas as much as 90 percent of the population is afflicted. Today we have enabled the Viet-Namese to treat 70,000 persons a month. The program is so popular that families behind the Communist lines around Hanoi sneak through for treatment. We help them for humanitarian reasons, but we know that when they return home they are our best propaganda weapon in our psychological war.

Psychological war inevitably brings to mind Leo Hochstetter, who accompanied me on my trip through Southeast Asia. Leo is known as the Marconi and Alexander Graham Bell of Indo-China. Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam—comprising the Associated States of Indo-China—form an area slightly larger than Texas half of it mountainous, populated by 29 million people drawn from many ethnic groups and speaking three major languages. Many Indo-Chinese are illiterate. There are few newspapers, radio sets are scarce, and the rural postal system has been disrupted by the Viet-Minh. An information program was essential to combat Communist hand-to-hand propaganda, to publicize self-help techniques, and to advise the Ministries of Information how they could communicate with their own peoples more effectively.

Leo's answers have been tailored to meet the situation; air-drops of simple, colorful pamphlets over remote areas; a picture-poster wall newspaper showing concrete accomplishments; distribution of community radios to market places in remote villages; improvement of the national radio facilities; a system of mobile sound-movie trucks for otherwise inaccessible areas; participation in fairs and community gatherings with graphic exhibits; the maximum use of local-language newspapers. . . .

Leo's psychological war is paying off. Communists take every opportunity to undermine the MSA program in their propaganda. They recently turned out a pamphlet satirizing two of Leo's pamphlets. Leo isn't worried—"The Commies give us free publicity—they can't propagandize against good health, better crops, or emergency relief and make it stick," he says.

In Indo-China we no longer face a purely French colonial problem. We are up against a world problem. Our technical and economic-assistance program, I am convinced, is making a significant impression on the people, but they are not sure whether its ultimate purpose is to aid the cause of their independence or to solidify French colonialism.

A swift implementation of French promises of full independence would solve the dilemma. I should hope that Indo-China would choose to remain within the French Union, but this cannot be made a precondition of the negotiations. Independence, properly arranged, would not necessarily preclude a continuation of French economic and cultural interests in Indo-China, nor would it prevent the outside military aid necessary in the struggle against Communism. The probability is that Franco-Indo-Chinese relations, once firmly established on a mutually agreeable basis, might well attain new levels of mutually beneficial results.

But another step is equally important—the speedy fulfillment of the social reforms promised almost two years ago by Bao Dai. When the former Emperor of Annam was appointed Chief of State by the French in 1949, he was widely regarded as a playboy and his government as a puppet regime. During my conversation with him in his mountain lodge near Banmethuot, I found him an intelligent, earnest and democratic person, eager to push ahead with necessary reforms. We discussed the new cabinet he had appointed that week, and we talked about his announced plans for an adequate budget, agrarian reform, social legislation affecting worker welfare, credit institutions for small agricultural and artisanal borrowers, the institution of democratic elections. . . . I left with the feeling that these and other reforms could and would be achieved if Bao Dai was given vigorous support by both France and the United States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

CROCE'S PLACE IN ITALIAN CULTURE

by Paolo Milano

BENEDETTO CROCE, the Italian philosopher who died on November 20 at the age of 86, had been a leading figure in European culture for an unusually long time. The old humanist who, until a few weeks ago, was always ready to converse with some young American visitor, was the same man who had once corresponded with Friederich Engels. His published work is of staggering, "nineteenth-century" dimensions: fifty major books (of philosophy, political and literary history, economics, etc.), plus a steady flow of short essays, erudite reminiscences and critical notes; his enormous correspondence, still largely unpublished, may well amount to a comparable number of volumes.

For more than half a century, Benedetto Croce had been, if not the dictator, doubtless the Lord Protector of Italian culture. He had earned and deserved the role. When Croce's first studies appeared in the 1890s, the dominant philosophy in Italy was a species of positivism à la Herbert Spencer, with overtones of a rather crude Socialist materialism. Croce's early books (a pioneer work) were a philosophical appraisal of the economic thought of Karl Marx. He was the first to reach the conclusion, now a by-word in Western culture, that Marx's doctrine is not a system of scientific truths, it merely represents a *method*—one possible approach to social and historical reflection.

Croce's own philosophical system grew slowly during the first decade of this century. He presented himself as the heir to, and the modernizer of, Hegel's idealism, (his detractors often call him an epigone). Hegel's dialectical trinity (thesis, antithesis, synthesis) he replaced by a quaternary conception of human endeavor—art, philosophy, politics and ethics. Man (in turn a poet, a thinker, a utilitarian or a moral agent) moves in a dialectic of alternation, whose terms are distinct but not opposite; of this circular movement the "life of the Spirit" consists.

Croce's main distinction as a thinker, it is well known, lies in the field of aesthetics. Here he has been the indefatigable theoretician and systematizer of the main aesthetic views of the nineteenth century, which were implicit in the critical reflections of Baudelaire and Flaubert, as well as in the work of the Italian literary historian Francesco de Sanctis. For Croce art is an apprehension of the world through a "lyrical intuition," into which "form" and "content" combine. Art is "an aspiration within a representation."

These poor formulas are hardly a shadow of the complexity and richness of Croce's thought. The influence of this thought on the Italian culture of the 20th century has been exceptionally broad and penetrating; only John Dewey's role in American culture may provide a parallel. In Italy, Croce's philosophy not only left a lasting mark on the disciplines he cultivated, but also started new trends in such disparate fields as legal theory, linguistics, history of art, archeology and musicology. For decades, his system was the meeting ground of scholars, thinkers, critics, even journalists and politicians—it became their common intellectual language. Two generations of Italians were taught to think of philosophical problems through reading Croce.

Never a professor, Croce did not even aspire to a University chair. He was a gentleman of letters, a well-to-do landowner, who devoted his life to the humanities. Though he often paid his respects to Christian ethics, he was not a faithful nor practising Catholic; moreover, he fought at every turn clerical interference with secular culture, and on his death-bed he refused the last rites of the church. In the 1930s, when most of his books were put on the Vatican's Index, a witty *monsignore*, as the old philosopher was fond of telling, congratulated him with these words: "Now, we will all read your works."

Croce enjoyed a similar, exceptional favor among his adversaries from the Left, the present-day Italian Marxists. He was Italy's most distinguished anti-Communist; yet the patron-saint of the Italian Communists, Antonio Gramasci, had been nurtured in Crocean thought, and the present Party leader, Palmiro Togliatti, was always more ready to attack Croce than he was capable of shaking off his spell. In recent years, Croce stood, like a moderator (or rather, an arbiter) between the two "churches," the Catholic and the Communist, while they fought over the ideological allegiance of the Italians.

Politically, Croce belonged for a lifetime to the Liberal Party, an Italian equivalent of the British Conservatives. Before 1914, he had not spared parliamentary democracy his irony and criticism; and he did not condemn the Fascist regime until 1925, when tyranny had become all-pervasive. But from then on, throughout the Fascist era, Croce's service in the cause of Italian liberty was unequivocal, tireless, invaluable. In those decades, his *History of Italy* and his *History of Europe in the 19th Century* gave innumerable young Italians their first taste of intellectual and political freedom. Mussolini, who hated Croce enviously, could never bring himself to silence him for good.

Between 1944 and 1945, on the wake of Italy's liberation, Croce played for the first time a direct political role. He had been a Senator since 1910 and, rather shortly, a Minister of Education in 1920. Now, after the Anglo-American landings in the South, he became Italy's elder statesman and sage, whom both the liberators and the liberated welcomed as a guide. He failed to provide inspiring leadership. As a Minister of State in the Badoglio cabinet, confronted with the urgent problem of constitutional

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change, he favored the dubious, still-born solution of a regency. Soon he went back to his studies, retaining only the honorary presidency of the Liberal Party. He had always been reluctant to admit that Italy is not England, and that a *laissez-faire* parliamentarism, by leaving unsolved the structural problems of Italian society, could only perpetuate its instability and all of its evils.

Italians have often wondered why Benedetto Croce's fame abroad has not been greater. Is this due to historical circumstance, or to some objective limitation of Croce's thought? And what is the balance-sheet of Croce's semi-secular rule over Italian culture? The assets are evident; what about the liabilities?

The point to keep in mind in broaching an answer is Croce's dislike for, almost an innocence of, modern scientific thought. Unlike his great contemporaries and peers (Whitehead and Bergson, John Dewey and Bertrand Russell), he never conceded that a thorough acquaintance with biology and mathematics, with modern psychology and modern physics, is an indispensable tool for today's philosophers. Croce was a "pure" humanist, in the traditional sense of the word. He cared very little for anthropology; he recurrently denied to sociology, his pet bogey, even the right to call itself a science. Furthermore, in his own field of literature he had no patience with the gods of our contemporary Parnassus; his occasional notes on Mallarmé or Proust, on Joyce or Kafka, are ill-tempered and unperceptive.

It is easy to understand why, in England and in America, so many felt that Croce had little to offer them; it would not be difficult to show them their error. In Italy, too, a new generation may possibly think of Benedetto Croce as one of the gods whose day has passed; it would be ill-advised of them.

Croce's death leaves a huge gap wide open in the Italian culture. Obscurantist or cheap ideologies, variously pernicious, will certainly try to fill it. Communists and clericals are already battling over the succession.

Leafing through Croce's political essays, I have come across a statement, which in my opinion typifies what is best and yet what is weakest in his thought. Here it is: "I am often asked if I believe that the future belongs to freedom. My answer is that freedom has no need of the future—it already possesses eternity."

Paolo Milano, a critic of European and American literature, is on the staff of Queens College.

APPALLINGLY INSTRUCTIVE

IN THE NAZI ERA, by Sir Lewis Namier (St. Martin's; $2.25).

THE WELL-KNOWN English historian, L. B. Namier, is now Sir Lewis, but he remains the same careful, precise and logical analyst of documentary evidence that we have known of old. In the current volume he continues the studies in pre-war diplomacy presented in *Diplomatic Prelude* and *Europe in Decay*, but he announces in a preface that he is now through with this work and is returning to what he considers his own field, parliamentary history.

No hedonist will blame him, for pre-war diplomatic history is about as unpleasant a story as a chronicler ever set down. There is neither art nor science in it, and if one encounters trace of philosophy it is the philosophy of the Lord of Misrule, flat, stale and unprofitable. It is none the less worthy of examination for the pre-war period was also a post-war period, and we are now in another post-war period which a relatively low degree of stupidity may easily convert into a pre-war period.

The first part of *In the Nazi Era* is concerned with the spate of memoirs and alleged histories published since 1945 by the men who served Hitler; and the second part deals with the manoeuvres that led up to Munich. Neither is edifying, but both are instructive—appallingly instructive.

The dominant personality throughout the volume is, of course, Hitler but Sir Lewis is not primarily interested in him. His subject is the response of presumably normal men, German and non-German, to the stimulus of a psychopathic force; and his development of that subject is not reassuring. Whether the object was a member of German officialdom—diplomat, bureaucrat, soldier, politician—or some such figure as Henderson or Chamberlain, the impact of Hitler seems to have produced a horror that proceeded through terror into a sort of moral imbecility. Everyone agrees that Hitler was abnormal; but reading, not Namier but their own words as quoted by Namier, leads to the suspicion that there was not a normal man left in any European chancellory by 1939.

By the time that Neville Chamberlain was taken up into a high mountain and, for the promise not of the kingdoms of the world but merely of no disturbance of his own nest, fell down and worshipped evil, the very concept of objective truth seems to have vanished from the minds of statesmen. Hitler boasted of his skill in employing the technique of the Big Lie, but it is questionable that he ever told any man a lie as tremendous as the one Chamberlain told himself when he chose to believe that peace is obtainable through poltroonery.

It was too big a lie for the Germans, except one, to believe it possible that a Prime Minister of Great Britain had swallowed it. But the one exception was Hitler, and his was the only opinion that counted. So Germany, quaking with fear, acted on the theory that Chamberlain had persuaded himself to believe what no English statesman could possibly believe—and that insane theory proved to be correct!

From that moment, of course, madness swept the Reich like a prairie fire, and the discovery that Chamberlain misrepresented the British people came too late.

In one sense all this is merely very dirty water over the dam, and that may be a just view for Englishmen to take. But Americans should look at it from a different angle. We are standing now where Britain stood in those critical years. The chief statesman now representative of the old morality resides, not at 10 Downing street, but at 1600 Pennsylvania avenue. Fifteen years after Munich the one man who can shatter the world's faith that there is a difference between truth and falsehood is the American President.

So for Americans Sir Lewis has produced something more than a new Book of Lamentations; it is also a grisly warning, a suggestion that, "there, God forbid, go you!" GERALD W. JOHNSON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RADICAL THEOLOGY

THE COURAGE TO BE, by Paul Tillich (Yale; $3).

ALTHOUGH it is not yet widely known, theology is once again a serious contender for its ancient throne as "queen of the sciences." The abdication forced upon it by the rise of modern knowledge and the rejection of the dogmatic method seemed until recently to be final. But the radical theologians among whom Tillich is the leading figure may compel us to suspend this judgment. Except where they try to re-validate the Christian Revelation, their position has become a strong one. Admittedly, the exception indicated is important, but it does not vitiate the soundness of their main contentions since these are developed not through the metamorphosis of dogma but through a complete acceptance of depth psychology as interpreted by the logic of existentialism.

Existence, including the existence of human percipiency, is an irrefutable fact. Science of every sort depends upon it. Nothing can be objective in the sense that it is known to us otherwise than through experience. Mathematics itself is nothing more than an experiential system of related regularities. Standing on this sure ground, Tillich restores existentialism to its centrally historic form as it was before Hegel submerged it and as he believes it will be again when Sartre no longer warps it, and proceeds to re-make theology.

How radical the new departure is can best be conveyed to the reader who is not yet acquainted with it by quoting the statement in Tillich's *Systematic Theology* that "it is as atheistic to affirm the existence of God as to deny it" because the God of theism must be transcended; or, as he puts it in his Terry Lectures at Yale University (1952), here under review, religion cannot be effectual until the God of theism "has disappeared in the anxiety of doubt."

Tillich is not easy reading. One winces a little at recalling that these lectures were first delivered orally: it must have been strenuous listening. One cannot imagine a more stripped-down style; at times it is only one remove from algebra. But there is no doubt of the accuracy with which intent and meaning are communicated.

Beginning with a historical survey of the nature and meaning of courage from Socrates to Nietzsche, followed by a post-Freudian analysis of anxiety, which must be differentiated from fear since the latter has definite objects whereas anxiety does not, the three categories of typical human anxiety (non-neurotic) are described. The first is "the anxiety of fate and death," arising from the insecurity of circumstance and the contemplation of "the loss of self" that comes with death. The second category is "the anxiety of emptiness and meaninglessness," which Dr. Tillich thinks is the dominant anxiety of the present age. The third is "the anxiety of guilt and condemnation," which was dominant in earlier centuries and is formidable even now.

Conventional religion does not remove these anxieties, and gives at best only "the courage to be, as a part" (i.e. a part within a "collectivism" such as a confessional church or the Communist party; and also a part, rather than the whole, of oneself in these allegiances) instead of "the courage to be, as oneself" (i.e. a complete person in full and free encounter with reality).

A differential diagnosis of pathological anxiety, which Tillich provides so that his central thesis may be disencumbered of it, should be of special interest to psychiatrists, few of whom tread on firm ground when a patient's neurotic anxiety, accessible (it is hoped) to therapy, is reinforced by one of the three non-neurotic anxieties which psychiatry is unable to cure. This section, even out of context, is a remarkable contribution to a clearer understanding of the anxiety-neuroses and has already attracted considerable attention.

The three typical anxieties in encounter with "the courage to be" are discussed by Tillich in the context of "collectivist manifestations" and "democratic conformism," from which is developed the conclusion that anxiety cannot be dissolved but must be absorbed into the soul through "the courage to be" and this will require an active and continuous struggle with doubt and despair. It is from despair that faith, liberated by courage, takes its rise and no other faith is efficacious, except for "the courage to be, in part." There can be mastery but not victory, sufficiency but not finality. This is the ontological fact about human nature which is the key, not to comprehension, but to viable faith and affirmation. That the ethical struggle requires the ontological insight, and that this is provided by depth psychology, existenially interpreted, is Tillich's starting-point for a new and radical theology.

In the new theology, the God of tradition will have no place. He must be lost in the mists of despair and thus make room for "the God above God," who is beyond image and concept and can be experienced but not known, the God who is the companionate vitality of the human spirit and the creative ultimacy of all that is real.

How far has Tillich succeeded in producing a convincing new theology? It is too soon to know. How complete is his solution of the ontological problem as developed in his present book? "There is no chance," he says, that he can have succeeded "where Socrates failed," but "the courage of risking an almost unavoidable failure may help to keep the Socratic problem alive." In this, at least, he has succeeded; and he also has presuaded us, I think, that failure in the end may be avoidable.

A. POWELL DAVIES

AFTER READING GAOL

OSCAR WILDE: *A Present Time Appraisal*, by St. John Ervine (Morrow; $3.50).

WHY DID St. John Ervine write this book of 330 full pages? For a large part of it, he uses a kind of biography of Wilde as a framework for the meditations of St. John Ervine on such diverse topics as Pacifism, Pelagianism, Fundamental Biology, Arts and Crafts, the Morals of Bastardy, Individuality vs. Statism, and of course Eire and Ulster and the roster of wits who got out of Dublin as fast as they could. These fairly complete little rhapsodies—pell-mell of prejudices, rationalizations, and reasons—are uniformly without novelty and unpro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fitable to read, but they are at least vigorously opinionated and the author is getting something off his chest. Now this is a classical genre: to meditate on an exemplary life as a means of mobilizing and integrating one's own tag-ends (it is the genre of the *Imitatio*). It helps the author find a thread in his own life and thoughts; and often, also, it does something for the exemplary model itself, by bringing its meaning up-to-date and drawing out new ramifications.

The puzzle with this book, however, is that Ervine disdains his exemplar. "Wilde," he says at the end, "came into the world with a small talent and made little of it." Half way through, his considered judgment is that "Wilde had skill in the composition of unimportant plays which must have made him a fairly rich man had he been normal in mind and habits. That, however, is all that can be said." And of his life he says, "A faith that led a man to Reading Gaol and a squalid end in France is one to be avoided . . . Wilde went down the drain." What then is the point of such a long meditation on such a theme? Obviously it can do nothing for the contemptible model (although, I must say, in the midst of one of Ervine's dusty tirades a tiny misunderstood quotation from Wilde shines with a sunny sanity that it lacks in its own text). And from the point of view of the author, the exercise must be disintegrating, an avoidance of anxiety by babbling in fits and starts; it leaves Ervine in the end less Ervine than he was in the beginning.

As a critic of drama, Ervine uses the same technique of the avoidance of the exciting and anxious-making with an extraordinary directness—one can hardly believe that he is not making a satire on himself. Almost his sole resource is to point to improbabilities outside the plot, as that: it is 1895, Chiltern is now 40; the Suez shares were sold, we know by history, in 1875 when Chiltern must have been 20, but at that age he could not have held the position attributed to him, etc. But such acumen is strangely irrelevant; a play is what the playwright presents us with and makes important and believable. One gets the impression that our critic is never sitting in the theatre at all. He expresses total disdain for Aristotle as a critic, but he should really—really he should—meditate a little on *Poetics* 1454b and again 1461b, remarks on relevant and irrelevant improbability that, one would have thought, any theatre-goer would know by his mother-wit.

Early in the book, Ervine peevishly remarks that few people would know of Wilde if he hadn't gone to prison. I think that is true. What does it mean? Most people who went to prison are forgotten. Isn't it clear that in the exceptional cases the ordeal imparts or brings out or spectacularly proves a certain *meant*-ness in the rest of the behavior and words: the everyday life is fused into a whole, such as it is, and becomes exemplary? In Wilde's case, for instance, we have the obviously willed ordeal conflicting with his need to be loved and popular even on false pretenses, and his going through all the intermedium of this: this is what is witnessed and this makes us take the paradoxes or the theme of *Earnest* as somehow meant and weighty; and they thereby still teasingly provoke our own uneasy existences, when the mere flash of wit would be outdated. Because of his life, his sentences and plots are loaded and must still be taken into account—just as a banality by Goethe is not a banality, because it is by Goethe. Ervine makes the remark in spite and envy; but he need not be spiteful, *he* has his reward and Wilde has *his* reward.

Finally, what the devil does Ervine have against "stable-boys and ostlers" who were, I suppose, the auto-mechanics and truck-drivers of those horsy days?

PAUL GOODMAN

THE STORY OF ECONOMICS

IDEAS OF THE GREAT ECONOMISTS, by George Soule (Viking; $3.50).

MANY GREAT MINDS, from Adam Smith to J. M. Keynes, have spun imposing theoretical structures which were assumed to embody universally valid conclusions about economic life. Seductively logical, such structures have, however, been subject to marked obsolescence. The history of economic thought is strewn with the bones of discarded doctrines, which subsequent generations found to be unsuited to the needs and facts of their day.

In some 200 pages, George Soule explains the high lights in the story of economic reasoning from the Greeks to Keynes, John R. Commons, and Wesley Mitchell. By careful selection of material and felicity of wording, the author has made this concise history of the "dismal science" interesting, even intellectually exciting.

Such a story could leave the general reader depressed by detailed evidence of rationalization, doctrinal intransigence, and arid abstraction. Mr. Soule does indicate how the ideas of the economic greats served the purposes of contemporary interest groups, how high-powered minds often soared far from economic reality, and how prone economists have been to ignore inconvenient facts in order to preserve the purity of a doctrine.

The author, however, avoids cynicism by giving each writer sympathetic and balanced treatment in terms of the circumstances influencing his analysis. Furthermore, Soule's sketch of the whole evolutionary sweep of economic thinking enables the reader to appreciate not only the complexity of the subject but the progress that has been made in developing a body of theory appropriate for our mixed type of economy. The cultural lag is certainly being shortened in economics.

Review of the history of economic thought shows the need for an evolutionary viewpoint that avoids doctrinal rigidity, that shuns unprovable generalizations resting on equilibrium assumptions, and that stresses repeated testing of hypotheses by careful observation and systematic investigation of actual experience.

In the past, the great forward strides have been made by men like Adam Smith, Alfred Marshall, and Keynes, who thought in terms of the whole economy, who possessed considerable practical knowledge, and who had some thesis or position they sought to substantiate.

The economics of the future must make further allowance for intsitutional factors. Individualistic economics needs

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be replaced in part by an economics of groups and organizations—large corporations, large unions, and large governments.

Knowledge of past developments and errors in economic thought should help economists to make the best use of their talents and laymen to avoid mental bondage to some ancient doctrine that is ill-suited to present-day conditions. Now there is less excuse for repeating the economic errors of the past—in thought as well as in action.

In writing this much-needed survey of a different subject, Mr. Soule has supplied a useful springboard for further progress in man's quest for economic undertsanding. It can be perused with profit by the professional, as well as the amateur, economist.

RICHARD LESTER

TWO BOOKS ON ETIQUETTE

COMPLETE BOOK OF ETIQUETTE, by Amy Vanderbilt(Doubleday; $5).

ONE-UPMANSHIP, by Stephen Potter (Holt; $2.75).

IF YOU ARE NICE and want to be nicer, you must get hold of Amy Vanderbilt's new book, which tells you how to mind your manners, and everyone else's, if you like. Mrs. Vanderbilt courageously faces such important problems as what to do with spoiled food at a formal dinner, how to keep your servants and drunken guests in their place, when not to play television sets and games, how to liven up your conversation with foreign words and phrases. According to Mrs. Vanderbilt, when you are ready for someone to call you by your first name, you should say: "*Do* call me Joan." And I, for one, hope that you will.

If, however, you are already far too nice, you will need to read *One-Upmanship*, the third of an important set of studies on behaviour patterns and their control. Mr. Potter's work is designed to make the law of fang and claw, the notion of the survival of the fittest, work for *you*, in *your* drawing room, *your* office, at games, at the doctor's office.

I assume that most readers are familiar with the basic principles of Potter's new science, known under the general heading of *Lifemanship*. Lifemanship is designed to help one win games, conversations, and other competitive activities by demoralizing opposition. The practice of Lifemanship is, of course, ancient. (Several figures in *The Iliad* were, in their primitive way, expert Lifemen.) Potter and his associates, however, have made enormous strides in reducing Lifemanship to an exact science, something which can be practiced with success by any idiot who is willing to learn a few simple rules of thumb. His studies are concerned with the documentation of certain Lifemanly phenomena, and are sprinkled with helpful hints for daily living.

His new book, for instance, has a valuable section on how to deal with the singularly one-up medical profession. Anyone whose sickness has been aggravated by the behaviour of his physician will be pleased at the methods Potter offers for putting the doctor on the defensive. Perhaps the most valuable section of *One-Upmanship* is that concerned with the presentation of gifts —the wrong gifts, of course—to people of all ages. Potters suggestions in this field should be useful the year around, and must have been helpful to many.

But *One-Upmanship* is not a book for the uninitiated. It is rather the development of that theory so superbly exposed in Potter's earlier *opera, Gamesmanship* and *Lifemanship*. A novice who wishes to attain a mastery of the Potter Way of Life will be richly rewarded for the time he spends mastering the basic ploys and gambits recommended in more elementary volumes.

The Lifemanship Council offers, for sale, such practical items as unmatched socks, the famous Mrs. Wilson dummy (the death of any party,) and now a superb artificial rock to be climbed by lazy sportsmen.

If you are not interested in becoming a Lifeman yourself, you will need the three books anyway. Keep them in the medicine chest for use in emergency. Lifemanship is being practiced now on a scale which would have been undreamed of only a few years ago, and must be understood by anyone who hopes to survive.

ROBERT EVETT

I HAVE A BRIGHT IDEA

by Eric Bentley

THERE'S A GAME children love, or used to, that begins with the exclamation "I have a bright idea!" Whoever is on hand has to ask whether it is animal, vegetable, or mineral, and so forth, until the answer—invariably a rather silly one—is found. I wonder if the "ideas" of contemporary culture are prompted by any less childish impulse or can, when identified, by greeted with any greater satisfaction. To begin with, they are not ideas. Ours is the age of substitutes: instead of language, we have jargon; instead of principles, slogans; and, instead of genuine ideas, Bright Ideas. Bright Ideas win elections, and a cluster of them constituted a "theory" which justified the slaughter of six million Jews. A Bright Idea is an invalid idea which has more appeal to the semi-literate mind than a valid one; a phenomenon of some importance in a culture whose diagnostic is semi-literacy. It is a thought which can't bear thinking about, but which is all the more influential on that account; it surprises or reassures, it flatters or inflames; if it cannot earn the simple epithet "true" it frequently receives the more characteristically modern eulogy of "intriguing" or at least "interesting." At the very worst it is praised as "cute." The modern person, engaged in that search for meaning in life which formerly was known as the religious and philosophic quest, flits from one Bright Idea to another, divorce being as frequent in the ideal as in the real world. "I can't *tell* you what this book will do for you," a Los Angeles lady sighed into my ear, "it's *so* semantic!" She had a Bright Idea.

Nearly sixty years ago, Shaw wrote: "If the world had no more ideas than the theatre has, how long would society hold together?" Today, one is tempted to retort, society teems with ideas but is holding together only by the skin of its teeth, while the theatre teems with the same ideas and, far from holding together, is losing out to films, fiction, and TV. The retort would be unjust: because when Shaw said "ideas" he meant it. What our theatre and society teem with are the fads, or Bright Ideas,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which he spent seven decades denouncing. There is a miniature, but perfect, example in his correspondence with Mrs. Campbell. After seeing the actress in *Macbeth*, Shaw wrote her: "I couldn't understand the sleepwalking until D.D. told me someone had told you that Lady Macbeth should be seen through a sheet of glass. I wish I had been there with a few bricks. . . ." That sheet of glass is the very archetype of theatrical Bright Ideas. For every Shavian window-breaker, there are half a dozen glaziers, calling themselves directors or teachers of acting. Indeed, a director hesitates to stage Shakespeare today *unless* he has a Bright Idea. One of the simpler Bright Ideas is transfering your play to another period for no sufficient reason; *The Taming of the Shrew* is "more intriguing" in the costumes, and amid the furniture, which we associate with Jane Austen. This transference (not an invented one) is arbitrary. We have recently witnessed some that are not, and they are even worse. Chekhov's Russia and Verdi's Africa have been transferred to the US South, the idea being that domestic affairs are more real to an audience than foreign affairs. It may be a true idea, all that's wrong is that it doesn't apply to the matter in hand. In context it is only a Bright Idea.

Marx and Freud had ideas; Broadway has Bright Ideas. Counsel for playwrights accused of Marxism should plead the *a priori* impossibility of guilt: a playwright with *no* ideas cannot be found to have Marxist ideas. What the "social" playwrights took up in the Thirties was a set of Bright Ideas whose sole purpose was to give us the feeling of heroism without enjoining on us the duty of being heroic. They could therefore be sincere in withdrawing when the feeling of heroism gave place to the feeling of fear. Today, it is not Marx but Freud who turns in his grave every time a Drama of Ideas opens on Broadway or in the West End. The theatre which Shaw berated for its hedonism now lectures us on the sex problems of adolescents and the complexes of old maids. The "master-drama" of this generation is *A Streetcar Named Desire*. When a series of young actors auditioned for me not long ago I had the impression of seeing Blanche Dubois and Stanley Kowalsky over and over again, though my records indicated I had witnessed scenes from a dozen different plays. More than one of the young men even dressed like Stanley. Marlon Brando's T-shirt has attained the dignity of a Bright Idea.

Can't a man improve his plays by filling them with Improving Ideas? Can't he make them profounder by referring to profound subjects? That seems to be the logic of Messrs. Moss Hart and John van Druten in their latest offerings. Ideology is a great temptation. You imagine that all you need to do is refer to schizophrenia and you are exempt from the onerous duty of *creating* a schizoid character. You imagine that all you need to do is refer to religion many times and you have dramatized faith. On the first night of Van Druten's *I've Got Sixpence* it was God who turned in His grave. The play is "religious" in the same sense as that Californian lady's book was "semantic." Salvation here is just as mechanically contrived as in any proletarian drama of the older generation. The god from Mr. Van Druten's machine is as unreal as Tennessee Williams' god from the orgone box.

"Going Serious" has been, perhaps, the commonest Bright Idea of them all. In the Thirties it meant communism or the Buchmanite movement. To Mr. Van Druten today it means Californian religion. In nearly all instances it has meant an artistic decline. Nor need we accept the moral earnestness of the gesture at face value. Among the people one has known well, those who have gone serious have not always gone best. Most of us too easily admire the sudden dive into a Cause, *any* cause; there is sickness in our admiration. Causes are Bright Ideas. In soberer moods we grant that *The Climate of Eden* is a bad play, *Once in a Lifetime* a good one. Better no ideas than Bright Ideas. Yet, to be sure, a cult of anti-intellectualism—"the peasants in Mexico are happier illiterate"—would be the ultimate Bright Idea. The corrective to Bright Ideas lies not in No Ideas (that is, in the idea of no ideas) but in—ideas.

BOOK

New York's dirty politics exposed!

THE RAT RACE

by Edward Rager
former N. Y. City Councilman

A shocking expose of the unholy alliance between politics, vice and crime in New York. More sensational than anything the Crime Investigating Committee may uncover—by a man who witnessed the "deals" being made.

$3.50. At Bookstores, or:
VANTAGE PRESS • 120 W. 31 St., N.Y.

LITERARY SERVICES

WRITERS! TV MINDED? You do not have to be a television writer to write for TV. Outline, synopsis, plot, etc., will suffice. MEAD LITERARY AGENCY, 419 Fourth Avenue, New York 16.

ORANGES AND GRAPEFRUIT

TOP GRADE, TREE RIPENED, INDIAN RIVER GRAPEFRUIT AND ORANGES, freshly picked, tastefully packed. Grand for eating, juice, gifts. Guaranteed. Express prepaid. Bushel $6.50. Half bushel $4.50. (East of Miss.)
James H. Hart
Island Groves, Route 2, Cocoa, Florida.

PEP
Pamphlets

• Single copies of the broadsheets issued by Political and Economic Planning (London) may still be purchased from the New Republic for 25c cash postpaid. The most recent issues are:

#332 The Sterling Area—I
#332 The Sterling Area—II
#333 Land-Use Planning
#348 New Thinking on Monopoly
#334 The Control of Investment
#335 The Gramophone Record
#336 The Prospects
#337 Home Ownership
#338 The Future of Leasehold
#339 Exports—A Longer View.
#340 The World's Food
#341 Film Business
#342 France—Some Economic Factors
#343 Colonial Development
#344 Poverty
#345 France—Reconstruction & Investment
#346 Technical Assistance I—Agencies and Programmes
#347 Technical Assistance II—Policy and Method

Price 25¢—Order from
The New Republic
40 EAST 49 STREET New York 17, N. Y.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N. ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PREVIEW — 1953

THE year now ending was the most exhilarating in the *New Republic's* long history. A tremendous up-surge beginning with the Stevenson candidacy has been followed, since the election, by an even more extraordinary rise in readership.

This is in part a tribute to the role played by the *New Republic* in a country served by a big-business, one-party press. But more than that, it registers the determination of aroused liberals to help keep the Stevenson spirit and program before the public next year and thereafter.

New and gift subscriptions received from the announcements on this page must have set new records for a magazine of our circulation. More than 700 orders have so far been received from the advertisement of November 17 alone.

We repeat again the 13 weeks for $1.00 special new and gift subscription offer for any who have not yet entered subscriptions for friends or who may wish to begin 1953 by adding to those already sent.

The first issue of the new year (January 5) will contain *Greetings to Stevenson* from a number of leading writers, artists and scholars, commenting on the part liberal intellectuals can play in preserving the Stevenson spirit; a special issue is planned for Inaugural Week which will list the major programs now outstanding, what President Truman proposed, what General Eisenhower promised and how leading Senators stand. Soon to come also will be articles on where the Plunder Bund may strike—to lay claim to off-shore oil, public lands, forests, public housing and federal power projects. Also a careful analysis of how the 80-percent Press treats the United Nations.

Please use the order form below. One dollar buys 13 weeks of the *New Republic*, America's most distinguished journal of opinion and literary weekly.

----------TEAR OFF HERE----------

13 WEEKS FOR $1.00 SPECIAL OFFER

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $..... please send the New Republic for the next 13 weeks to the following:

NAME..... NAME.....

ADDRESS..... ADDRESS.....

CITY & ZONE.....STATE..... CITY & ZONE.....STATE.....

NAME..... NAME.....

ADDRESS..... ADDRESS.....

CITY & ZONE.....STATE..... CITY & ZONE.....STATE.....

The Charles C. Sherrod Library 12-29-52
4-5570 EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED